



911 Standards Committee

Meeting Summary

NC 911 Board Standards and Enforcement Committees

November 12, 2014

10:00 AM-12:00 PM

CenturyLink Office

14111 Capital Blvd

Wake Forest, N.C.

<u>Standards Committee Present</u>	<u>Staff Members Present</u>	<u>Guests Present</u>
Rodney Cates	Tina Bone	Lee Canipe (by phone)
Barry Furey	Richard Bradford	
Christy Shearin	Ronnie Cashwell	
Jimmy Stewart	Dave Corn	
Laura Sykora, Chair	David Dodd	
Donna Wright (by phone)	Richard Taylor	
<u>Standards Committee Absent</u>	<u>Staff Members Absent</u>	
Margie Frye		
Dinah Jefferies		
Brandon Zuidema		
<u>Enforcement Committee Present</u>		
Greg Foster		
Judy Jenkins		
John Letteney		
Carson Smith		
<u>Enforcement Committee Absent</u>		
Jeff Dulin		
Jim Soukup		

Chairman, Laura Sykora called the meeting to order at 10:05 PM. The roll was called, and those on the phone identified. Brandon Zuidema was recognized as the newest member of the Standards Committee, replacing Wayne Cyrus, who has retired.

Dave Corn reviewed the last meeting, reminding the Committees that it was primarily a discussion with changes made to the Compliance/Enforcement Process. Laura Sykora added that the Compliance Process was discussed during the Standards portion of the PSAP Managers Group meeting and it seemed to be well received.

Laura Sykora began reviewing the Compliance Process with the Committees. Richard Bradford suggested changing the word “infraction” to “deficiency.” Richard also remarked that he believes that one other major issue left to discuss is in Item Number 2 of the Compliance Process. Who are the people that will make up the peer review, and how will they function? He further explained that Statutes are laws that are put in place by the Legislature, Rules are binding mandates that do not carry the weight of statutes but interpret and apply the Statutes. Policies are procedures that further define how the Rules will be applied. Further clarifying the review process and how this will be done is important.

Richard Bradford added a new Rule that summarizes Section 200 of the Rules entitled Assessing PSAP Operations that speaks to the peer review process. Rodney Cates asked if the inspectors will provide suggestions as to how deficiencies are mediated, or is it up to the PSAP to come up with the proper ideas. Suggestions from inspectors can be included in the response, but would not be required.

The question was asked if seven days is enough time to do the inspection and still receive good feedback to the PSAP managers. Donna Wright was ok with 7 days, but Tina Bone thought that may put a hardship on the Staff who presumably would write the Response. Laura Sykora proposed a time period of 14 days, and everyone agreed.

Laura Sykora moved back to the question of peer review, overseen by staff members. Richard Bradford stated that while the people may not need to be identified, the process should be understood by the Committee and the Board. Donna Wright suggested that PSAP managers in each region select a group of managers in their regions to act as inspectors. Barry Furey suggested that the inspectors probably should not inspect PSAPs in their own regions due to political and other factors. Christy Shearin opined that there should be inspectors from various PSAP sizes. It was suggested that the Inspection team consist of three (3) PSAP Managers. Dave Corn argued that the team size of 3 PSAP managers was a goal and that if there were a team of 2 or 4 PSAP managers this should suffice. After some discussion there was agreement on the Committees that Inspection teams comprised of approximately three (3) PSAP managers from a different region than the PSAP being inspected and led by a Staff member should inspect PSAPs and if possible the PSAP managers should come from large as well as small PSAPs.

Barry Furey asked about the process going forward? If everyone was to be inspected in the same year? He asked if that is even do-able? He asked what if the majority needed to be inspected in the following year? Would inspecting a large number of PSAPs in three year cycles impact the work of PSAP managers and Staff? He asked if we would not be better served by a staggered approach? Richard Taylor replied that this would be an in-progress process. We will learn as we go. No decision was made by the Committees on this point.

Tina Bone recommended that the PSAP manager inspectors should be chosen from those who have “approved” PSAPs meaning PSAPs who have previously passed inspections. It was pointed out that as of this date no PSAP has been inspected and therefore approved. Laura Sykora said perhaps the process of pre-inspecting PSAPs prior to the rules becoming effective could result in a pool of “approved” peer reviewers. Richard Bradford said the Board may not need a lot of detail as to the selection process for reviewers, but they will need a general understanding.

Laura Sykora then moved to a discussion on proposed definitions. Definitions are normally placed at the beginning of the document and there was general agreement on the Committees to make that change. It was asked

if the term “check list” needed to be a definition and the response was no. Richard Bradford preferred the use of the term “site visit” rather than “inspection” because the term is broader and suggested that the Board may determine the need for additional information, over and above the simple inspection process. It was agreed to change the term “inspection” to “site visit.”

David Dodd provided an update on the Backup PSAP process. There are still only 32 approved plans. Several PSAP managers have requested copies of, or access to, the new Statute that requires backup PSAP plans. Laura Sykora asked about the term “redundancy” in the backup plan. The explanation was satisfactory.

Laura Sykora then asked Richard Bradford to provide an update of the Rules process. At the last meeting, Richard Bradford asked the Committee to make changes to the policies/procedures. All agreed and that has been done. Richard Bradford said the Rules will be filed through a Notice of Text, as soon as he and Teresa Banks can dot all the Is and cross all the Ts. He speculated that if all the timing works out, this will be on the Board’s agenda at their January meeting. This could qualify as the required Public Comments meeting which is a requirement of the Rules process. He cautioned that the overall time frame is still not determined. If the public hearing is held in January, the hearing before the Rules Commission might happen by April. Laura Sykora asked if the Committee could resume work on the Checklist once the Notice of Text was filed? Richard Bradford said that since the Checklist was mostly finalized, it would be better to wait until the process is nearer completed.

Laura Sykora then asked if the changes discussed today could be placed into the document and disseminated to the Committee for approval, prior to the December Board meeting. Dave Corn agreed to do that.

Laura then asked for a discussion of possible new initiatives for the Committee to consider such as standards for text-to-911. Richard Taylor thinks texting to 911 should be something the Committee should explore, as well as the process of developing an IP network. Interoperability among PSAPs is another area that may benefit from standards. There was also a discussion on radio interoperability, but it was pointed out that this is something the Board does not have authority over.

Donna Wright asked about an older version of the rules. Why was the requirement of two people in a PSAP taken out? Richard Bradford replied that it was removed because the Rules Review people determined that because the 911 Board cannot pay for salaries by Statute, this would not make it through Rules review. Richard Bradford said some agencies such as Sheriffs Standards and NC OEMS have the authority to require people and training, but other agencies and the 911 Board does not.

Laura Sykora asked if there were other topics to consider. Tina mentioned EMD as a possibility, which was agreed to by other committee members. No further topics introduced this discussion was tabled for another meeting.

Dave Corn questioned whether the Committee needed to look at some standard for the purchase of equipment or services. Richard Taylor said the Finance Directors invited to the PSAP Managers meeting, were amazed at the information the Board has on purchases. They would like the Board to post this type information on their website so they can see the materials being purchased and the prices being paid. This discussion was not pursued further.

Carson Smith asked if the Board could develop state contracts for eligible PSAP equipment? Richard Taylor said this is something he thinks is very close to happening. Richard Bradford said the Board can develop convenience contracts. He opined that to obtain good prices from prospective vendors there has to be a bulk purchase with quantities known and possibly committed to. In a competition between a known purchase amount against an unknown purchase amount, the known purchase amount will always result in a better price. Also there will also

always be situations where vendors will offer better pricing based on the time of year, and how bad they need to move something to make quotas.

Laura Sykora asked about a good time to meet again. After discussion the next Standards meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 15th at 10:00AM. Location is to be determined.

Barry Furey announced to the Committee he is retiring, and will be leaving the Standards Committee at the end of this year. Laura Sykora thanked him for his years of service on the Committee.

John Letteney also announced he had been appointed to a Board position with the International Association of Police Chiefs, and will be asking the NC Police Chiefs to replace him on the Standards Enforcement Committee.

Laura Sykora adjourned the meeting at 12:20 PM.